

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559/380001/P10186

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Specification

Paragraphs 2 and 11 have been amended to correct the typographical errors identified in the office action.

Claim Objections

Claims 18, 25, and 27 have been amended to correct the typographical errors identified in the office action.

35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 11, 16, 26, and 27 have been rejected under 35 USC § 112 as allegedly being indefinite for referring to a "discovery document". This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, the claims have been amended to clarify that a software file comprises the discovery document.

35 USC § 103

Claims 1-5, 9-20, and 24-30 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) over Barroux, Feridun, and Libert. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559/380001/P10186

Claim 1 defines a method that comprises, inter alia, coalescing discovery data including two or more duplicate data entries in a software file comprising a discovery document, and removing all but one of the duplicate data entries from the discovery document.

Claim 16 defines an article including instructions residing on a machine-readable medium that cause a machine to conduct steps similar to those defined in claim 1.

Barroux describes the collection and management of survey information about nodes in a network. Instead of coalescing data, in col. 9, line 62 to col. 10, line 9, Barroux describes the generation of a new record with a new version number when configuration information of an asset is changed. With this arrangement, records having differing version numbers are created rather than creating multiple duplicate entries.

Feridun relates to the aggregation of correlation events relating to the satisfaction of correlation criteria. There is no further discussion regarding the aggregation of data. In particular, Feridun does not disclose that data is aggregated from two or more discovery agents.

Libert is cited as teaching coalescing discovery data in a discovery document that includes two or more duplicate data events. Libert is also cited as teaching removing all but one of the duplicate data events from the discovery document.

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559/380001/P10186

However, it is respectfully submitted that this analysis of Libert is inaccurate.

For example, Libert in col. 6, lines 64-66 states that XML parsers translate XML data to/from software documents that are manipulated by agents and ensure that the XML is well formed. This passage does not describe coalescing discovery data or otherwise fusing data to form a discovery document as stated in the office action. Rather, Libert describes translating XML data passing to and from software documents.

Libert continues on col. 8, lines 21-23 by describing an application determining whether to create a new Universal Resource Name (URN) or to create a new version of an existing URN. This passage does not suggest that duplicate data entries created as URNs are identifiers for system assets (see, inter alia, Libert col. 7, lines 55-57).

Moreover, Libert in col. 12, lines 58-61 states that an asset management system deletes from storage material that is no longer needed. There is no suggestion that this deletion relates to all but one of the duplicate data entries (and Libert does not suggest that there are duplicate data entries).

There is no motivation for the skilled artisan to combine Barroux with Feridun and Libert to result, inter alia, in the subject matter defined by claims 1 and 16, because Barroux does

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559/380001/P10186

not describe an arrangement in which multiple data entries are generated and Libert does not teach coalescing data.

Even if such motivation did exist, there is no suggestion for the skilled artisan to result in the subject matter of claims 1 and 16 due, inter alia, to the deficiencies in each of Barroux, Feridun, and Libert described above.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 16 and those dependent thereon should be allowable.

Claim 12 defines a method comprising registering a first plurality of agents, performing a first discovery operation including, collecting and aggregating data from a first plurality of network devices with the first plurality of agents the data including two or more duplicate data entries, coalescing the data in a software file comprising a discovery document, registering an additional agent, and performing a second discovery operation with a second plurality of agents including the first plurality of agents and the additional agent. The coalescing comprises removing all but one of the duplicate data entries from the discovery document, assigning a key to each network device based on a precedence file containing instructions for generating keys, and appending the precedence file to the discovery document.

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559/380001/P10186

Claim 27 defines an article including instructions residing on a machine-readable medium that cause a machine to conduct steps similar to those defined in claim 12.

As described above in connection with claims 1 and 16, the cited references fail to suggest, inter alia, coalescing discovery data in a discovery document that includes two or more duplicate data events and removing all but one of the duplicate data events from the discovery document. On this basis alone, claims 12 and 27 and those dependent thereon should be allowable.

The cited art, whether considered singly or in combination, also does not describe or suggest assigning a key to each network device based on a precedence file containing instructions for generating keys and appending the precedence file to the discovery document. Although Barroux illustrates the use of a CID that can identify a system operating at a referenced node, there is no suggestion on how a key is assigned and to append a precedence file to the discovery document.

Accordingly, claims 12 and 27 and those dependent thereon should be allowable.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559/380001/P10186

rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Please apply \$120 for the one month Petition for Extension of Time fee and any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

 42,773Date: February 7, 2005

Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030
Attorney for Intel Corporation

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer Number: 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
10473222.doc